UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,052	03/12/2004	Alan George Cole	YOR920030610US1	6731

48062 7590 06/16/2008		
RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP		
1300 POST ROAD		
SUITE 205		
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824		

EXAMINER
LE, MIRANDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

<u>Independent claims 36-39, 43</u>

1. Richton does teach "receiving one or more rules"

In response to Applicant's argument with respect to "the Examiner has equated "receiving one or more rules" with "receiving airline info"…Thus, Richton does not teach *receiving one or more rules*", the Examiner respectfully traverses.

According to the instant specification, the present invention provides techniques for evaluating spatial rules over a mobile population. The spatial rules <u>involve locations of entities from the mobile population</u> [0006], "when evaluating rules in a communication network, one or more attributes of an entity are determined, where one of the attributes comprises <u>location of the entity</u>. One or more rules are evaluated to produce one or more results, each of the rules operating on the one or more attributes of the entity. One or more specified actions for the rules are performed, based on the evaluation of the one or more rules" [0007], and "Rules may <u>apply to particular geographical regions, to particular subscribers, to both, or to additional criteria</u>" [0008].

Analogously, Richton provides method for wireless telecommunications system that provides <u>location-based information delivery to a wireless mobile unit</u>. As such, both inventions relate to distributed processing using communication systems.

"Rules", hence, correspond to "airline info" because <u>this airline information is integrated into a rule-based decision making</u> of Richton *(i.e airline flight schedules, schedules of individuals who have granted access to their daily/hourly schedules, road and traffic information, weather, etc. It will be familiar to those of ordinary skill in the art how somewhat diverse information sources can be integrated into **a rule-based decision making capability** of*

an IPA 330 or a general purpose computer, in a manner similar to the airline schedule example

given above and that all such various uses of diverse information, **in combination with location-**

based information*, are encompassed within the scope of the present invention, col. 5, line 65 to*

col. 6, line 16; <u>such as a specific airline for which flight information is requested could be</u>

<u>programmed in a remote IPA 330 of a user</u>*. This can be done* <u>in combination with rules</u>

<u>including simple rules involving weather data, for example, and complex rules involving</u>

<u>arranging connections and flights through a specific city to enable meetings with associates</u>*, col.*

7, lines 30-63; The user can theRichtonore be informed of not only normal flight schedule

information, for example, but of suggested changes and reasons for such changes. These may

involve application of a <u>simple rule in the IPA 330</u>*, such as a desire of the user to wait a short*

time should that allow the user to be comfortably put on a pRichtonerred airline, or very

<u>complex rules, such as diverting a user to another airport in a large metropolitan</u> *area such as*

N.Y. city, to provide a user with a desired opportunity to meet new associates, col. 5, lines 44-

64).

Not only that, the claimed limitation "rules" also equates to rule in the IPA of Richton

(i.e. The user can theRichtonore be informed of not only normal flight schedule information, for

example, but of suggested changes and reasons for such changes. These may involve application

of <u>a simple</u> <u>rule in the IPA 330</u>*, such as a desire of the user to wait a short time should that allow*

the user to be comfortably put on a pRichtonerred airline, or <u>very complex rules</u>*, such as*

diverting a user to another airport in a large metropolitan area such as N.Y. city, to provide a

user with a desired opportunity to meet new associates, col. 5, lines 44-64).

Therefore, it is apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art that Richton

discloses/suggests "receiving one or more rules".

2. Richton teaches "sending a trigger to the application based on the one or more rules"

A "trigger" is defined in the instant specification as follows:

[0110] A change in P, due to a new position report, <u>a change in S, or an explicit trigger</u>
<u>event generated by a timer</u> (see above), triggers evaluation of all rules at a LULS. Rules are
evaluated over the change, which <u>is represented as a subscriber position report</u>.

[0205] Section 1.1.2 above gave an example of a rule that triggers <u>when any truck of a</u>
<u>company leaves any warehouse of the company</u>. To be evaluated, this rule should have available
to it the geographical polygons that represent the warehouse area, which may be specific to that
application.

Accordingly, based on the excerpted paragraphs, Richton reads on the claimed limitation

"trigger" as *"sending data back to the wireless mobile **(alert)**"*; *"the location based*

pRichtonerence server 305 can associate either or both of the aforementioned information or

rule based pRichtonerence information, such as a particular desired airline (although these may

be more desirably stored in an IPA due to their changeability), as well <u>as location based</u>

<u>geographic relationship triggering pRichtonerences</u> (such as <u>when airline scheduling info should</u>

<u>be sent, i.e. within 2miles of the airport</u>). Of course, much if not all of this information is stored

in the memory of location-based service database 302, col. 3, lines 39-62).

Thus, contrary to Applicant's assertion, it is the Examiner's position that it is apparent to

a person of ordinary skill in the art that Richton discloses/suggests "sending a trigger to the

application based on the one or more rules".

3. Richton teaches "reducing said one or more rules based on subcribers

The instant specification describes "reducing rules" as follows:

[0125] Filter rules both offer convenience to a provider of an embodiment of the present invention, in that <u>filter rules obviate the need to include the filtering rules as constant components of normal rules, but they can significantly enhance performance as well in reducing the load of rule evaluation</u>.

[0201] Applications may also <u>subscribe to predefined rules, using a global rule identifier. The use of predefined rules enables applications to share rules, thus reducing the rule evaluation burden on LULS nodes</u>. Applications using predefined rules still receive individual reports.

In the same concept, Richton thus reads on the claimed limitation "reducing one or more rules based on subscribers" as the particular desired rules of Richton's end user *(i.e. Once the rule-based suggestion engine 600 of IPA 330 is <u>programmed</u> [predefined rules] <u>with the particular desired rules</u> so that desired information can be accessed, it then merely awaits the current geolocation data from the wireless network 640, which indicates the location of a wireless mobile unit 201 in one of a number of ways, so as to know when to trigger the application of the rules to the data and to trigger the output of data to the wireless mobile unit 201. Once the threshold, such as 5 miles from the airport, is triggered based upon the location of the wireless mobile unit 201, information is retrieved and modified and results of the expert system of IPA 330 are output from rule-based suggestion engine 600, formatted in element 650, and eventually output in a data push process 660 to the wireless mobile unit 201, through location-based server 221, WSC 220, and a controlling base station. It should be noted that FIG. 6 is merely exemplary to provide an illustration of how diverse data can be considered by a rule-based suggestion engine 600 of an IPA 330 to apply rules to data or information received; and*

to eventually modify and convey modified information to the user of a wireless mobile unit 201,

col. 13, lines 3-23).

Furthermore, it is noted that subscribers associated with one or more nodes equates to wireless mobile unit 201 associated with location based server 221 in Fig. 2 of Richton.

Therefore, it is clearly shown by Richton the step of receiving one or more rules from an application; and sending a trigger to said application based on said one or more rules, as required by independent claims 36, 37, and 38. Plus, Richton discloses or suggests receiving one or more rules in a node; and reducing said one or more rules based on subscribers associated with one or more of said nodes, as required by independent claims 39 and 43. The knowledge that is within the level of one of ordinary skill is clearly explained for the Applicant's convenience. The Examiner believes that the Applicant has failed to determine the level of ordinary skill as taught by the prior arts. It is noted that even though the Examiner recognizes the fact that the claimed invention somewhat differs from the Richton reference. However, the independent claims as drafted, are broad enough to be met by the prior art; consequently, the claim language does not fully reflect the nature and structure/function of such evaluation of spatial rules over a mobile population process.

Dependent Claims 1-35, 40-42, 44-46

Since Richton does disclose each and every element recited in Applicant's claims 36, 37, 38, 39, and 43 for the reasons set forth above; and the claim language as presented is still read on by the Richton reference at the cited paragraph in the claim rejections, claims 1-23, 24, 25-35,

40-42 and 44-46, which are dependent on claims 36, 37, 38, 39, and 43, respectively; are not

patentably distinguished over Richton.

        In conclusion, the claimed invention as represented in the claims does not represent a

patentable over the art of record. Applicant is encouraged to amend the claims to better reflect

what Applicant intends to claim as the invention.

        Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

/Miranda Le/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2167